

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 2, 2009 the Office noted that claims 24-34 were pending and rejected claims 24-34. Claims 24-31 have been amended, no claims have been cancelled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 24-34 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24-26 and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Britt, U.S. Patent No. 6,615,042 in view of Cheng, U.S. Patent No. 5,502,759. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Britt discusses a method in Wireless Intelligent Network of handling subscriber services, the network comprising communication channels supporting control signals necessary to manage phone calls. In particular, Britt seems to disclose steps for coordinating operations between several centres dealing with requests of services from clients (col. 5, line 55 through col. 6, line 38).

Cheng generally relates to methods for preventing toll fraud. However, Cheng relies upon a network allowing call handling with a cluster of service centres (col. 10 lines 10-12).

On page 3 of the Office Action, it is acknowledges that

Britt does not disclose "in that one of the centres transmits its address to the other centre by inserting this address in one of the call control signals transmitted to the other centre, and in that the centre having received the address inserted in a call control signal establishes the co-ordination connection by using communication channels which are separate from those used to convey the call control signal in which the address of one of the centres is inserted," as in claim 24, but asserts that Cheng, col. 12, lines 11-17 and Fig. 1, 20, 90-91 does.

However, it appears clearly from Cheng that Service Control Points play the role of centres as they provide a service upon request (see for example col. 10, lines 19-27). By contrast, Service Switching Points SSPs mainly act as switching units routing requests to adequate Service Control Points SCPs (see for example col. 10, lines 31-36). Having identified the right Service Control Point SCP for handling a given request, a Service Switching Point SSP fills in the header of said request with the address of said Service Control Points SCPs (col. 12, lines 7-15). Then the request can reach the right Service Control Points SCP who process the request (col. 12 lines 15-21). At the end the result is sent back to the Service Switching Point SSP (col. 12 lines 21-26).

Consequently, Cheng does not disclose the transmission of said call control signals to a second centre, since only one Service Control Points SCP is involved for a given request and no

messages are exchanged for handling a request between Service Control Point SCP.

Furthermore, Cheng does not disclose a co-ordination connection by using communication channels which are separate from those used to convey the call control signal in which the address of the first centre is inserted. As already quoted, Service Switching Points SSP (col. 12, lines 21-26) are not coordinated, they process requests independently, and no co-ordination connections are established between two Service Switching Points SSP. Moreover, no separate channel is used since all requests and signaling messages are supported by the common channel signaling (see description col.8 lines 13-18 and col. 12, lines 20-38).

Independent claims 32 and 33 recite similar features such that the arguments above apply likewise to them as well. For at least the reasons discussed above, Britt and Cheng, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 24, 32 and 33 or the claims dependent therefrom.

On page 5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Britt, col. 4, lines 27-29; col. 8, lines 1-5; and fig. 3, 13-14 and 31 discloses "when a plurality of call processing phases are carried out simultaneously for different clients of the network, the centre which inserts its address in the call control signal further inserts an identifier of the call processed, and in that the first and second centres for carrying out services indicate

the call concerned by means of the co-ordination data transmitted via the co-ordination connection by using this identifier so as to co-ordinate their respective operation for processing each call," as in claim 25.

However, Britt fails to disclose "the first and second centres for carrying out services indicate the call concerned by means of the coordination data transmitted via the coordination connection by using this identifier so as to co-ordinate their respective operation for processing each call." Britt only discloses the insertion by Mobile Switching Centres of WINCAP parameters which describe the Mobile Switching Centre's WIN capabilities. This identifier is not bound to a given call. It also appears from the figure 3 that handling of a query by a SCP can be concurrent: SCPs are not co-ordinate. Britt, for example col. 8, lines 1-5, only discloses the possibility to concurrently sending queries to several SCP, but no means for coordinating their respective operations for a plurality of calls.

On page 5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that col. 8, lines 18-22; and fig. 3 disclose "wherein only the co-ordination connection is used to exchange co-ordination data for the respective operations for processing the first and second service requests implemented by the two centres for carrying out services," as in claim 26.

However, Britt discloses neither a specific co-ordination connection nor the use of an identifier.

Claims 28-31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Britt in view of Cheng in view of Hoffman, U.S. Patent No. 7,248,576. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Hoffman does not disclose establishing coordination connections between control centres for carrying out services in an intelligent network.

Therefore, Hoffman adds nothing to the deficiencies of Britt and Cheng as applied against the independent claims as argued above. Therefore, Britt, Cheng and Hoffman, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 28-31.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Britt in view of Cheng in view of Maloney, U.S. Patent No. 5,555,299. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Maloney discusses a method for transmitting a call between pluralities of call centres. The method as in Maloney coordinates a voice component and a data component of the call. However, Maloney does not disclose establishing coordination connections between control centres for carrying out services in an intelligent network.

Therefore, Maloney adds nothing to the deficiencies of Britt and Cheng as applied against the independent claims as argued above. Therefore, Britt, Cheng and Maloney, taken

separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 27.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 24-34 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston/
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jr